

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. In the above referenced Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-12 under 35 USC § 102 (b) as being anticipated by McMahan (U.S. Patent No. 5,859,541); and claims 13-24 under 35 USC § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over McMahan (U.S. Patent No. 5,859,541) in view of Pruett (U.S. Patent No. 6,490,121). The Examiner has objected to claim 19 due to an informality. The rejections and objection have been traversed and, as such, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the allowability of claims 1-24.

2. The applicant has amended claim 19 to overcome the informality objection.

3. Claims 1-12 have been rejected under 35 USC § 102 (b) as being anticipated by McMahan (U.S. Patent No. 5,859,541). With respect to this rejection, the Examiner has maintained the rejection and rationale therefore from the office action of 3/21/05 and has provided a response to the applicant's argument. The applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's arguments supporting this rejection and in deeming the applicant's previous arguments as non-persuasive.

The Examiner's response to arguments focuses on McMahan teaching that the output buffer may be tri-stated based on the various quotes regarding the states of the control signals. McMahan does not teach that the various buffers may be tri-stated (e.g., on, off, or in a high impedance state), but teaches that they the buffers are

either connected via a coupling transistor to the output pin or not. (Column 4, lines 39-43) Thus, McMahan does not teach or suggest a second driver as is claimed in claim 1.

In addition, the Examiner has apparently overlooked the other arguments of the applicant. In particular, with respect to claim 1, the applicant made the argument that:

McMahan's output buffers are either connected, providing a predetermined impedance, or disconnected, so as to control the overall output impedance. McMahan does not disclose suggest or teach a configuration where the drive level is controlled in a first and second state between first and second drive levels [based on the load requirements of the line being driven by the programmable driver].

The applicant contends that controlling the output impedance of an output buffer as taught by McMahan is not the equivalent of, or suggestive of, controlling the driver level (e.g., the power level capabilities) of the programmable driver of the present invention. For instance, a buffer may have a desired output impedance but fail to provide the necessary drive if the load of the buffer is too great. McMahan does not address, teach, or suggest generating a control signal based on the load requirements of the programmable driver as is presently claimed in claim 1, but teaches generating control signals based on a desired output impedance.

In particular, McMahan teaches, at column 4 lines 8-13, [a] high-performance application using a terminated line requires a low output impedance in order to obtain proper logic levels at the output. A lower cost, non-

terminated line application requires a higher impedance to avoid unacceptable line ringing. The embodiments of Figures 3 and 4 provide an output buffer having a selectable output impedance.

Clearly, adjusting the output impedance of a buffer to accommodate for different line terminations of McMahan is not the equivalent of, or suggestive of, adjusting the drive capabilities of a programmable driver to accommodate for load requirements of claim 1.

Based on the foregoing, the applicant believes that claim 1 overcomes the present rejection.

With respect to claims 2 and 3, McMahan does not teach or suggest an enable signal in addition to the drive control signal. Thus, in addition to the arguments that distinguish claim 1 over the present rejection, the applicant believes that this argument distinguishes claims 2 and 3 over the present rejection.

Claims 4-6 introduce additional patentable subject matter with respect to claim 1. As such, the applicant believes that claims 4-6 overcome the present rejection in light of the arguments that distinguish claim 1 over the present rejection.

Claim 7 includes similar limitations as claim 1 with respect to generating a drive control signal based on load requirements of the programmable driver. As such, the applicant believes that the reasons that distinguish claim

1 over the present rejection are applicable in distinguishing claim 7 over the same rejection.

Claims 8-12 introduce additional patentable subject matter with respect to claim 7. As such, the applicant believes that claims 8-12 overcome the present rejection in light of the arguments that distinguish claim 7 over the present rejection.

4. Claims 13-24 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over McMahan (U.S. Patent No. 5,859,541) in view of Pruett (U.S. Patent No. 6,490,121). The applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's arguments supporting this rejection.

Since, as demonstrated above, McMahan does not teach all of the features of the claimed invention, the applicant believes that claims 13 - 24 overcome the present rejection.

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant believes that claims 1-24 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that they be passed to allowance.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone or facsimile if the Examiner believes that such a communication would advance the prosecution of the present invention.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

By: /Timothy W. Markison reg. 33,534/
Timothy W. Markison
Phone: (512) 342-0612
Fax No. (512) 342-1674

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING
37 C.F.R. 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Alexandria, Virginia 22313, on the date below:

Date

11-10-05

Aiane Hudson

Signature